

REMARKS**Summary of the Office Action**

Claim 9 stands objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a) as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter because of informalities.

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Berstis (U.S. Patent No. 6,182,010 B1) (hereinafter “Berstis”).

Summary of the Response to the Office Action

Applicants have canceled claims 2, 3, 5 and 15-17 without prejudice or disclaimer. Applicants have amended claims 1, 8 and 11 to differently describe embodiments of the disclosure of the instant application and/or to improve the form of the claims. Accordingly, claims 1, 4, 6-14, 18 and 19 remain currently pending for consideration.

Rejection under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a)

Claim 9 stands objected to under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(a) as allegedly failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter because of an alleged informalities. In particular, the Office Action states that “said display part” lacks antecedent basis. Accordingly, claim 9 has been newly-amended in response to the comments at page 2 of the Office Action. Withdrawal of the objection to claim 9 is thus respectfully requested.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Berstis. Applicants have amended independent claim 1 to differently describe embodiments of the

disclosure of the instant application's specification. To the extent that these rejections might be deemed to apply to the claims as newly-amended, they are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

With respect to the subject matter of claim 1, the Examiner pointed out that Berstis teaches a "display apparatus (10-fig. 3) for use in an electronic equipment (vehicle), having a display panel (12) for displaying images (fig. 1; fig. 3; col. 5, lines 3-24)." The rejection went on to assert that Berstis includes "a storage part contained in said electronic equipment for storing display data representing display images to be displayed on said display panel (col. 4, lines 47-56 and col. 6, lines 38-41...)" and "a writing part (server 40) for receiving display data from the outside of said electronic equipment to write into said storage unit as said display data (col. 8, lines 12-15; col. 4, lines 64-66)."

The Examiner's interpretation of the Berstis disclosure in the Office Action is that "electronic equipment" reads on the data transceiver and GPS equipped vehicle of Berstis, and "storage part" reads on the computer 10's RAM and mass storage 54 of Berstis.

Applicants have newly-amended independent claim 1 to describe a display apparatus combination that includes particular features in that "said storage part is contained in a display panel portion of said electronic equipment, and writing of display data into said storage part is enabled when said display panel is detached from a device body portion of said electronic equipment." At least these particular features of independent claim 1 are neither shown, nor even suggested by the disclosure of Berstis.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully assert that the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) should be withdrawn because Berstis does not teach or suggest each feature of independent claim 1, as amended. As pointed out in MPEP § 2131, "[t]o anticipate a claim, the reference must

teach every element of the claim." Thus, "[a] claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference. Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. Of California, 2 USPQ 2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987)." Furthermore, Applicants respectfully assert that the dependent claims are allowable at least because of their dependence from independent claim 1, as amended, and the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the pending claims are in condition for allowance, and respectfully request reconsideration and timely allowance of the pending claims. Should the Examiner feel that there are any issues outstanding after consideration of this response, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' undersigned representative to expedite prosecution. A favorable action is awaited.

EXCEPT for issue fees payable under 37 C.F.R. § 1.18, the Commissioner is hereby authorized by this paper to charge any additional fees during the entire pendency of this application including fees due under 37 C.F.R. § 1.16 and 1.17 which may be required, including

any required extension of time fees, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0573.

This paragraph is intended to be a **CONSTRUCTIVE PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME** in accordance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.136(a)(3).

Respectfully submitted,

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP



Dated: December 6, 2005

By:

Paul A. Fournier
Reg. No. 41,023

Customer No. 055694

DRINKER BIDDLE & REATH LLP
1500 K Street, N.W., Suite 1100
Washington, DC 20005-1209
Tel.: (202) 842-8800
Fax: (202) 842-8465